



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
Modern Language Association of America

1913

VOL. XXVIII, 3

NEW SERIES, VOL. XXI, 3

XII.—THE MEDIÆVAL DEBATE BETWEEN WINE
AND WATER

Among the mediæval debates which have enjoyed the widest currency and have retained their hold on popular interest for the longest time is the contention between Wine and Water. Poems on this subject are extant in most of the languages of mediæval Europe; and the tradition has persisted with surprising vitality through more than seven centuries down to the present day. The bickerings of these two ancient foes may still be heard on the lips of the peasantry of Germany, France, and Spain, and a fragment of the same dispute was sung not long since as a nursery rhyme in Devon.

The history of this typical example of the *conflictus*, that species of disputation in which the contestants are not individuals but personifications or types, possesses considerable interest, first as a record of popular taste, secondly because of its bearing on the distribution of such material in the middle ages and on the relation between the literary and popular treatments of the same theme.

I. LATIN

The earliest extant pieces in which Wine and Water argue their relative merits are two Latin poems, one existing in fragmentary form among the *Carmina Burana*¹ and printed in full by Du Méril² from a thirteenth-century manuscript, the other given by Wright in his *Latin Poems Attributed to Walter Mapes*, and frequently elsewhere.³ Both belong to the general class of writing known as Goliardic, but they differ strikingly in tone and contents.

The first version (which I shall hereafter designate by its opening *Denudata Veritate*) is of especial importance in the present study. It was composed at least as early as the beginning of the thirteenth century,⁴ probably much earlier, whether in Germany, as may perhaps be inferred from its inclusion among the drinking songs in the *Carmina Burana*, or elsewhere, we cannot say.

The particular theme of the poem is the toper's passionate conviction that wine and water should be kept apart, and his uncontrollable indignation at the thought of mixing them. This moral is announced by the author in the opening lines:

¹ Ed. Schmeller, No. 173.

² *Poésies inédites*, p. 303. A verse translation into English may be found in J. A. Symonds's *Wine, Women, and Song*.

³ Wright, p. 87; J. Grimm, *Kleinere Schriften*, III, p. 78; Mone's *Anzeiger*, xv, p. 285; Novati, *Carmina Medii Ævi*, p. 58; A. Bömer, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, N. F., vi, p. 123. Cf. *Bibl. de l'école des chartes*, XLVII (1886), p. 89.

⁴ The Benedictbeurn collection was written down, as Meyer has shown (*Fragmenta Burana*, p. 17), about 1225.

Denudata veritate
 Et succineta brevitate
 Ratione varia,
 Dico quod non sociari
 Debant, immo separari,
 Quæ sunt adversaria.

For the first two stanzas there is no hint of a dispute. Then suddenly the idea is dramatized:

Vinum sentit aquam secum,
 Dolens inquit: Quis te meeum
 Ausus est conjungere?
 Exi foras, vade cito:
 Moras non eodem loco
 Mecum debes facere.

It is only, however, when Wine continues to revile its antagonist on general grounds of inferiority that the debate proper may be said to begin:

Super terram debes teri
 Et cum terra commisceri
 Ut in latum transeas:
 Vilib et inverecunda
 Rimas quæris ut immunda
 Mundi loca subeas.

Mensa pro te non ornatur;
 Nullus per te fabulatur
 In tui præsentia,
 Sed qui prius est jocundus,
 Ridens, verboque facundus,
 Non rumpit silentia.

The irate liquor then goes on through two unquotable stanzas to describe, with growing concreteness of language, the nauseating effect of water on the system. At this the latter breaks the silence, describing with humor the results of too free a use of wine:

Tu scis linguis impedire:
 Titubando solet ire
 Tua sumens basia;
 Verba recte non discernens,
 Centum putat esse, cernens
 Duo luminaria.

Et qui tuus est amator,
 Homicida, fornicator,
 Davus, Geta, Birria.¹

“ For your wickedness you are kept under lock and key, while I roam at large through the world. I convey pilgrims to the gates of Heaven.”

“ You are treacherous,” cries Wine in reply. “ You shipwreck those who trust you and send them to eternity. A god am I. I am the source of wisdom and sound counsel, as Naso writes. I cure the lame, the halt, and the blind; I renew the youth of age.”

“ A god, indeed,” says Water. “ You turn good men into bad, and make your devotees talk nonsense. I speak truth; I make all things fertile. Your mother, the twisted vine, would be fruitless but for me. For me all people pray.”

“ That you are common shows what you are worth,” answers the other. “ You are associated with the most disgusting places.”

At the description which follows Water is justly shocked and cries out shame. Wine fires a quick final shot in the accusation that Water often infects the drinker with fatal

¹ Davus is the slave in the *Andria* of Terence, Geta in the *Phormio*. But the allusion in the case of the last two names in the line is undoubtedly, as Professor J. D. M. Ford points out to me, to the Latin poem, *Geta aut Carmen de Amphitrione et Alcmena*, attributed to Vital de Blois (fl. c. 1150) and based on the *Amphitruo* of Plautus (see Thomas Wright's *Early Mysteries*, p. 77).

disease. Then Water suddenly and somewhat unreasonably gives up the fight.

Audiens hæc, obstupescit
 Aqua; deflens obmutescit,
 Geminat suspiria:

Vinum clamat: Quare taces?
 Iam patet quod victa jaces,
 Rationis nescia.

In the closing stanza the moral previously announced is emphasized by the partial author:

Ego præsens disputation
 Hujus cantus terminator,
 Omni dico populo
 Quod hæc miscens execretur
 Et a Christo separetur
 In æterno sæculo.

As a "carmen jocosum" this little disputation is not without merit. It has humor, freshness, and genuine potatory fervor; the author's easy and highly scandalous use of the language of church and school imparts a ludicrous effect which could hardly have been attained through another medium. It is not surprising that the poem should have inspired other writers to imitation.

The style and general tone of the piece ally it closely with the drinking songs of the period. The idea that the two beverages are essentially antipathetic and must be kept apart recurs again and again in the Latin verse of the twelfth century, appearing, for example, in the following epigram, which was current throughout Europe and may now be confidently assigned to Hugo of Orleans:¹

¹ See Meyer, *Die Oxford Gedichte des Primas, Göttinger Nachrichten, Phil.-Hist. Classe*, 1907, pp. 149 ff.

In cratero meo Thetis est sociata Lyeo,
 Et dea iuncta deo, sed dea maior eo.
 Non valet hic vel ea, nisi quando sunt pharisea¹
 Hec duo, propter ea sit deus absque dea.
 Res tam diverse, licet utraque bona per se,
 Dum sic perverse coeunt, perdunt paritur se.

It appears again in a song in the *Carmina Burana*:

Deo dea ne iungatur,
 Deam deus aspernatur,
 Nam qui Liber appellatur
 Libertate gloriatur,
 Virtus eius adnullatur
 In poculis,
 Et vinum debilitatur
 In copulis.

The praise of wine, with a corresponding malediction of water is still more common. Compare for example the drinking song in Novati's collection (p. 69), which ends with the following stanza:

Alba limpha maledicta
 Sit a nobis interdicta,
 Quia splenem provocat.

In number 178 in the *Carmina Burana* the same contrast is made as in the debate:

Aqua prorsus coitum nequit impetrare,
 Bacchus illam facile solet expugnare.²

And in another lyric in the collection an identical biblical quotation is applied to the miracle working powers of Bacchus:

¹ *I. e.*, divisa, separata; Heb. phares, divisio. (Du Cange.)

² In the debate Wine says:

Per me mundus reparatur
 Per te nunquam generatur
 Filius vel filia.

Das ceco visum, das claudio crura salucis;
Crederis esse deus, hec quia cuncta facis.

So Wine boasts in the debate:

Claudus currit; cæcus videt;
Surdus audit; mens subridet;
Per me mutus loquitur.

These are the commonplaces of Goliardic drinking songs. The poem under discussion is simply the same material thrown into a novel form. It is, like the lyrics quoted, primarily a panegyric on wine, a toper's malediction of water, and an emphatic protest against the unholy practice of diluting the one with the other.

That the author of the *Denudata* should have developed this theme into a contest for superiority is not to be wondered at. The debate was in the twelfth century well established as a type in Latin literature, and one characteristic application of it was for the purpose of exalting one quality or thing at the expense of its opposite. Thus in the debate of Winter and Summer, one of the oldest and best known of mediæval disputations, the sympathies of the author are almost always on the side of Summer, which overwhelmingly defeats its adversary; in the debate between Christian and Jew, in that of Faith and Reason, and in many others, the upshot of the whole is the defeat and humiliation of one of the parties.

In *Denudata Veritate*, when at length the drinks are actually contending, the argument is by no means one-sided. Water is quite capable of defending itself. And from this point of view the poem is more nearly related to those debates which balance the advantages of two things of the same class, as the lily and the rose. As far back as classical times there are traces of disputations in which

the respective merits of different foods are contrasted.¹ And the subject of a fourth-century Latin poem, which has almost all the characteristics of a mediæval debate, is a contention between a cook and a baker as to the relative merits of their arts.² Later we have a battle between the kinds of food eaten in Lent and those eaten at other times,³ and finally, in debates perhaps inspired by the dispute of Wine and Water, we have poems in which the different classes of wine are opposed to each other, and in which wine is compared with other liquors.⁴

The second Latin debate, entitled in Wright's reprint *Goliae Dialogus inter Aquam et Vinum*, is strikingly in contrast with the debate which I have just described. Whereas the *Denudata Veritate* is, as we have seen, simple, concrete, and lyrical, the *Dialogus* is didactic and steeped in pedantry. Most of the arguments are derived from scripture, and the main interest of the poem lies in the amazing ingenuity with which they are applied.

The introduction of the *Dialogus* is couched in language evidently parodying the conventional beginning of a monkish vision:

¹ Suetonius, *Tiberius*, cap. 42: "Asellio Sabino sestertia ducenta donavit pro dialogo in quo boleti et ficedulæ et ostreæ certamen induxerat." Cf. also the *synkrisis* of pease porridge and pease soup mentioned by Athenæus (iv, 157 b) as one of the writings of the Cynic philosopher, Meleager of Gadara.

² *Vespæ Judicium Coqui et Pistoris*; Bæhrens, *Poet. Lat. Min.*; Riese, *Anthol. Lat.*, I (i), 199.

³ *La Bataille de Karesme et de Charnage*; Barbazan et Méon, *Fabliaux et Contes*, IV, p. 80. For various Italian versions see Batinæs, *Bibliografia delle Rappresentatione Sacre*, pp. 77 and 78. The material is treated in Spanish by Juan Ruiz in the *Libro de buen amor*. In these poems the sympathies of the author are on the side of the richer diet. A curious echo of the allegorical battle of foodstuffs is to be found in Rabelais, *Pantagruel*, XL and XL.

⁴ See below.

Dum tenerent medium omnia tumultum,
 Post diversas epulas et post vinum multum
 Postquam voluptatibus ventris est indultum,
 Me liquerunt socii vino iam sepultum.

Ast ego vel spiritu vel in carne gravi,
 Raptus sum et tertium cœlum penetravi,
 Ubi sacratissima quædam auscultavi,
 Quæ post in concilio fratrum revelavi.¹

The scene is the court of heaven, where Thetis and Lyæus enter and at once begin to dispute. The quality of their dialogue will be better conveyed by quotation than by summary. Thetis declares that she, as the first created thing, over which brooded the spirit of God, is deserving of the highest honor. Bacchus replies that he was given later as a more precious gift to the topers of the earth. Then the dispute proceeds as follows:

Thetis: Me vitis admodum Christus ampliavit,
 Quando me de puto potum postulavit;
 De torrente siquidem, attestante David,
 Bibit et posterea caput exaltavit.²

Lyæus: Uvæ nil aquaticum fecit intermixtum,
 Cum in vite Dominus fructum dedit istum;
 Ergo qui potaverit vinum aqua mixtum,
 Peccat contra dominum et adversus Christum.

Thetis: Me contentus respuit Nazareus vina
 Cum in me reposita sit vitæ medicina,
 Quod ex evangelica patet disciplina,
 Cum sanaret angelus agros in piscina.³

Lyæus: Te quivis aquaticus bibat Nazareus,
 Sed quantum salutifer sit effectus meus
 Patet, dum apostolis probat immo Deus
 Ut me propter stomachum bibat Timotheus.⁴

¹ I have used Bömer's text.

² Psalms, 110, 7.

³ John, 5, 4.

⁴ "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake." I Timothy, 5, 23.

Thetis: Medicinæ Naamam liquerant humanæ,
 Nec prodesse poterant cuti male sanæ,
 Cui voces propheticæ non fuerunt vanæ,
 Postquam fuit septies lotus in Jordane.¹

Lyæus: Cæsus a latronibus Jerosolymita,
 Visus a presbytero, visus a levita,
 Incuratus forsitan excessisset vita,
 Ni fuisset vulnera vino delinita.²

As the dispute goes on the arguments become rather more like those in the *Denudata Veritate*, but they are still interlarded with much scriptural and mystic lore. So long as the contestants reason, Thetis has somewhat the better of it, but Lyæus finally ceases to argue and clamorously glorifies himself in general terms. It is in vain that Thetis keeps to the point and mentions the Red Sea episode, from which she derives much honor. The poem shows signs of degenerating into mere panegyric when the denizens of heaven (some manuscripts read "avi-bus celi," some "civibus celi") clamor their approval of Lyæus's words; whereat the poet awakes and praises God! The concluding stanza bears a marked resemblance to the close of the well-known Latin version of the debate between the Body and the Soul, and may, perhaps, be regarded as a direct parody, though the common debt of both poems to the conventional language of mediæval vision is sufficient to account for their resemblance.

Comparing the *Dialogus* with the *Denudata Veritate*, we find some specific resemblances between them. In one passage in the *Dialogus* there is a trace of the idea which constitutes the main theme of the *Denudata*. "God," says Bacchus, "when he gave the vine mixed no water with the grape. For this reason it is heresy to drink diluted

¹ 2 Kings, 5, 14.

² Luke, 10, 34.

wine.'" The remark is not at all relevant to the discussion and is most easily explained as a reminiscence of the other poem.¹

The resemblances between the two debates are not so striking as their differences, certainly; still, it is at least possible that the author of the one had read or heard recited the other and derived from it the notion of embodying the contrast between Wine and Water in a debate. That the original form of the dispute was the *Denudata* seems likely in view of the prominence in this poem of the Goliardic motive of the antipathetic natures of the two liquids, the motive from which the idea of a contention apparently took its origin.

If, however, the author of the *Dialogus* took a hint

¹ Of other parallels the following are the most striking:

Claudus currit; cæcus videt;
Surdus audit; mens subridet;
Per me mutus loquitur. (*Denudata*)

Mutis eloquentiam, contractis salire,
Dat, et inter verbera facit non sentire. (*Dialogus*,
(Wright's text)

Nullus per te fabulatur. (*Denudata*)

Si quis causa qualibet cessat a Lyæo,
Non resultat canticum neque laus ab eo. (*Dialogus*)

Vinum hæc: te plenam fraude
Probas esse tali laude:
Verum est quod suscipis
Naves; post hoc intumescis;
Dum frangantur non quiescis
Et sic eas decipis. (*Denudata*)

Tu deceptrix hominum, quibus dum te præstas
Placidam, post fluctibus subditis infestas;
Rogat super alias iustus res funestas,
'Ne demergat,' inquiens, 'aquaæ me tempestas. (*Dialogus*)

from the *Denudata*, he took little more than a hint. The *Dialogus* was clearly developed under different influences. In the first place, we may observe its more complete assimilation to the conventional form of the Latin *conflictus*. In spite of the prejudice of the poet, the issue is clearly stated as one of relative superiority. The disputants plead their cause before a tribunal, and there is something like a judicial decision at the close. The matching of scriptural honors, sometimes in alternate stanzas, had been characteristic of the debate from its earliest appearance in the middle ages; but the use of such material had been, before the twelfth century, generally serious.¹ It remained for a later generation of clerks to inject into it the familiar mediæval spirit of religious parody.

In spirit and style, the *Dialogus* belongs with a large group of satirical and parodic poems, some of them debates, of which the *Confessio Goliæ* is the best known. Our poem is associated with the *Confessio* in several manuscripts, and both were ascribed in England to Golias and to Walter Map.²

In continental manuscripts, on the other hand, this poem is attributed to Primas. There can be no certainty as to its actual authorship.³ Of so much, however, we

¹ Cf. e. g., the *Ecloga Theoduli*, ed. Osternacher, and the *Conflictus Ovis et Lini*, Haupt's *Zeitschrift*, xi, p. 215.

² See Wright's collection cited above, p. 316.

³ In Grimm's Venetian manuscript the debate is labelled "versus primatis presbiteri." "Primas" as Meyer has shown, is Hugo of Orleans, who flourished about 1140 and was famous for his Latin verses for more than a century. To him were ascribed many Goliardic poems written later and by various authors. Salimbene appears to have confused him with Archipoeta, who flourished a generation later at Cologne and is unquestionably the author of the *Confessio Goliæ*. The *Dialogus* cannot possibly be the work of Hugo, since it differs entirely from his known poems in meter,

may be reasonably sure:—the *Dialogus* is closely related to the *Confessio* and to the satirical debates printed by Wright, and it is the work of one of a small number of highly gifted professional poets, to whom we owe the majority of the more elaborate Goliardic compositions.

A third Goliardic poem, the *Altercatio vini et cervisiae*, recently printed by Bömer¹ from a fourteenth-century German manuscript, deserves brief consideration here. In this piece the two beverages are not personified and do not contend, their causes being represented in turn by the author himself. In the opening lines, however, the writer shows that he thinks of his poem as a kind of debate.

Ludens ludis miscebo seria
 Ne fatiscant mentes per tedia;
 Nunc de bacho, nunc de cervisia
 Tractans lites tractabo iurgia.

Assit ergo vestra intentio,
 Non tumultu, sed cum silentio
 Explicetur hec disputatio
 Ad hoc tendit mea petitio.

“There are many who praise beer,” the poem continues, “and condemn the glory of the gods; its reign is universal and everybody drinks it,—kings, hermits, bishops, popes, matrons and maids, old and young, sick and well. You know well enough what is its excellence. Now let us consider the worth of Bacchus.” At this comes the really heartfelt panegyric, ending with an emphatic pronouncement in favor of the God of Wine. Both drinks

style, and subject matter. (The Goliardic stanza was almost unknown before 1150.) Its resemblance, on the other hand, to the *Confessio* and to other undoubted writings of the Archipoeta is so marked as to make his authorship not at all improbable.

¹ *Eine Vagantenliedersammlung des 14. Jahrhunderts*; Haupt’s *Zeitschrift*, 49 (1907-8), pp. 161 ff.

have their good qualities, but after all there is no comparison.

Ego mallem transire maria,
Quam sedere iuxta cellaria,
Ubi iacet festuce filia.
Tantum fetent illius dolia.
Bacchus vero vincit flagrantia
Thus, aroma, rosam et lilia. etc.

The poem thus appears to be, like *Denudata Veritate* and the *Dialogus*, a glorification of wine by contrast with a baser drink. A reference to the Emperor Frederick I (died 1190) makes it probable that the poem was composed in his reign; it therefore belongs to about the time of the Wine and Water debates. The line "non tumultu sed cum silentio" may possibly be an allusion to the opening line of the widely known *Dialogus*, "Dum tenerent medium omnia tumultum." Aside from this, however, there is nothing definite to connect this piece with either of the others.

The comparison of wine and beer forms the theme, also, of two poems by Peter of Blois (died c. 1200), a *Versus in commendatione vini* and a *Responsio ad quemdam contra cervisiam*.¹ In the first (rhymed hexameters) the poet lauds wine by contrast with beer, describing in detail the effects of each. The *Responsio* (elegiacs) is evidently a reply to some poem which apparently turned the tables on Peter's *Versus* by praising beer at the expense of wine. Beer is called "simia vini" (cf. the expression *simia Dei*, often used of Satan), and *horrendum genus aquæ*. Wine on the other hand, is the blood of Christ. At Cana water was changed to wine and not to beer. If you adduce the

¹ Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 207, col. 1155.

incest of Lot,¹ not wine but man's excess was at fault. At the close the pious and scholarly author safeguards his reputation by saying that this poem, like the one which provoked it, is only a harmless joke.

The three biblical applications in the *Responsio* are all employed in the *Dialogus* as well. They recur not infrequently in the later debates of wine and water.

More closely resembling the *Altercatio vini et cervisiae* in form is a series of German "Sprüche" comparing wine and milk, ascribed to Reinmar von Zweter.² The writer, speaking in his own person, praises first the milder and more common drink, and then turns to compare the merits of the other, finally awarding it the palm on the ground of its use in the sacrament.

II. FRENCH

The disputes between Wine and Water which begin to appear in the vernaculars of France, Italy, and Spain as early as the thirteenth century manifestly belong to the tradition inaugurated by the *Denudata* and the *Dialogus*. The resemblances which the vernacular debates bear to each other and to the two Latin poems are sufficiently numerous and close to establish an undoubted relation among them. But this relation is baffling in its complexity, and to define it exactly is, in our ignorance of what versions may be lost, impossible.

The earliest extant French poem on this subject, en-

¹ Genesis, 19, 33.

² Works edited by G. Roethe, Leipzig, 1887, p. 555 (nos. 297-299). See Hermann Jantzen, *Das deutsche Streitgedicht im Mittelalter*, pp. 35, 36.

titled *La Disputoison du Vin et de l'Iaue*,¹ stands somewhat apart from the others, having as its main theme a contention not between Wine and Water but between the various kinds of wine. The brief introduction, in the first person, bears some resemblance to the opening of the *Dialogus*:

Je fui l'autr'ier à une feste,
Au partir me dolut la teste,
Pour ce que je bus vins divers;
En mon chief monterent li vers
Qui me firent ce dist dister,
Que vous m'orrez ci recorder.

The God of Love is holding a feast, when the different wines engage in a contest over their respective merits. They range themselves four against four, and disturb the harmony of the occasion to such an extent that Cupid is obliged to summon a council of four other wines to hear their cause. *Aucerre*, as advocate of the party of the first part, makes the opening plea. The wine describes its own exhilarating and emboldening effects and praises its three companions. Then *Saint-Jehan* replies in behalf of the others, contrasting its own mildness with the violence of *Aucerre*, praising the color of *Gascon*, the curative properties of *Rochelle*. Judgment is demanded, but before it can be pronounced *Saint-Porçain* interferes, angrily assailing both parties and lauding itself. It is beloved of all the great lords and of the Pope; it is neither too red nor too pale, but of a beautiful *œil de perdrix* hue. At this rises *Vin françois*, indignant that these intruders should dare to praise themselves here in its own country. Its

¹ Jubinal, *Nouveau recueil* (1839), II, pp. 293 ff.; Wright, *Latin Poems*, pp. 299 ff.

characteristics are moderation and sanity. It gives health, peace, and joy, the three best things in the world. Last of all, Water very unexpectedly appears and pleads its case against all the wines, advancing many of the arguments we have already met with in the Latin poems and some others of a similar vein. The council reports to Cupid that he had better keep on good terms with all parties and especially with water, which can weaken and destroy wine by mixing with it. The god accordingly pronounces that each wine has its particular use and virtue, but that water as a common necessity deserves the highest honor. The wines then make peace with one another.

In this curious version of the Wine and Water debate we may note the attachment of the dispute to the court of Cupid, a feature which may be attributed to the influence of amatory disputes like the well known *De Phillide et Flora*, in which the introduction of the court of love machinery was appropriate and natural. The elaboration of the narrative element, the introduction of local color, and the adoption of the language of legal procedure, are in accord with a marked tendency in the vernacular debates in general.

The main theme of the *Desputoison*, the contest of the wines among themselves, finds an interesting parallel in Henri d'Andeli's *Bataille des Vins*.¹ Here King Philippe, who is the prince of connoisseurs, sends for various wines (all of them white, it would appear, though some are red to-day) in order to determine which is best. An English priest excommunicates certain undesirables; and others, conscious of inferiority, flee for fear of his wrath.

¹ *Oeuvres de Henri d'Andeli*, edited by A. Heron, Rouen, 1880, pp. 23 ff.

Then the wines begin angrily to dispute over their respective merits. As in the *Despupoison*, *Vin françois* defends itself against its assailants by praising its own mildness. The dispute waxes hotter and the wines nearly come to blows. The poet does not dare exactly to say they fight, though he clearly inclines to do so. The passage is interesting as an illustration of the tendency of the vernacular debate to pass over into action.

Qui la veïst vins estriver,
Et chascun sa force aviver
Et chascun mener son desroi
Sor la table devant le roi,
Ce n'est ore ne plus ne mains
Se vin eüssent piez ne mains
Je sais bien qu'il s'entretuaissent,
Ja por le bon roi nel lessaissent.

The king and the English priest now taste all the wines. The priest excommunicates beer, then sinks to the floor in a three-days' sleep. Meanwhile the king crowns the good wines, making *Vin de Cypre* apostle (cf. the *Despupoison*, where this wine was also awarded the highest honor), and *Vin d'Aquilat*, cardinal and legate. In addition, Philip creates three kings, three counts, and twelve peers of France! Whoever is so lucky as to have any one of them on his table need fear no disease. Others must take what they can get. But

Soit vin moiien, per, ou persone,
Prenons tel vin que Diex nous done.

The connections of this racy satire, in which the descriptive and narrative elements greatly overbalance the dialogue, are clearly, so far as form is concerned, with the poems of the *Psychomachia* type, like Henri's own *Bataille des VII Ars*. But it has departed more widely from this

tradition than *La Bataille de Caresme et de Charnage* mentioned above. For Caresme and Charnage are personified as two barons, who, with the foods eaten in each season as retainers, engage in a contest *vi et armis*. In the *Desputoison*, though the debate when once under way is wholly verbal, there are also some traces of the *bataille* connection. The wines give each other the lie and draw their swords. *Biaune* comes to the judgment day *la lance levee*.

In substance both Henri's poem and the *Desputoison* are allied with several treatises, not debates, in which the merits of different wines are discussed.¹

Such, then, is the lineage of the first part of the *Desputoison*. The anomalous and surprising introduction of water reflects clearly the influence of the debate of Wine and Water; and here the parallels with the Latin poems are close enough to be significant, if not conclusive. In the last lines of the French poem there appears a faint trace of the motive prominent in the *Denudata Veritate*, —that wine and water should be drunk unmixed:

Pès et amour ensemble firent,
Et puis ont sans iaue bœu.

The author of the *Desputoison* almost certainly knew the *Denudata* or some redaction of it; and he probably was acquainted also with the *Dialogus*;² but he depended on neither of these poems for more than a part of his general idea and a few details.

¹ See Héron, introduction, pp. liii ff., notes, p. 91.

² In both the *Dialogus* and the *Desputoison* Water boasts that it drives mills; in the *Denudata* and the *Desputoison* it mentions its usefulness in carrying ships, and declares that Wine could never exist without Water's help in making the vine fruitful.

With the next French poem, a *Débat du Vin et de l'Eau*, which dates from the fourteenth or early fifteenth century and exists in several fifteenth and sixteenth century prints,¹ the case is different; for this poem is clearly a version, direct or indirect, of the *Denudata Veritate*. The introduction shows a romantic, even mystical elaboration of the setting, which, as I have noted, is characteristic of the debates in their passage to the vernacular. In the Latin poems the circumstances of the dispute were left indefinite; in the French the scene is actualized. The poet is supping alone. He has a little pitcher of wine before him, only a "chopine," because it is dear. When the liquor begins to give out, he pours in some water. Straightway there is a great thundering in the vessel; then Wine and Water begin their dispute.

Li Vin dist que l'Eau se rendit,
Et qu'a terre se respandist.

All this is obviously an elaboration of the brief introduction of the Latin poem. Much of the argument which follows is borrowed in detail from the *Denudata*, but there are occasional independent parallels to the *Dialogus*, and a considerable amount of new material.

The conclusion of this debate, like that of the *Despu-toison*, elaborates in a narrative way the barren moral of its original. Wine, fearing the loss of its ease, goes to the "provost of gourmands" for support. That dignitary sends his sergeant, *Taste-Vin*, to take security from Water that it will not attempt to dilute Wine. "Since Water made this pact," says the poet in conclusion, "we should keep the two beverages apart, lest it be forsown." The

¹ See Montaignon, *Recueil de Poésies*, iv, p. 103; also *Le débat de deux demoyselles*, Paris, 1825.

last lines contain the acrostic signature, Pierre Jamec, or, in some prints, Pierre Japes.

A general characteristic common to both Latin debates and to the French *Débat* is a humorous affectation of learning on the part of both contestants. Thus Water makes the following recondite allusion:

Par tout sont en Sarrazinesme
Defenduz tes atouchemens.

And Wine attempts to overwhelm his opponent by citation of authority, as Chantecleer does Pertelote in Chaucer:

Je suis bevrage precieux
Comme pyment et ypcras.
Platon, Gallien et Ypocras
N'ont pas vers moi este ingratz,
Mais m'ont loue en plusieurs lieux.¹

These passages show the worthy Pierre to have been a man of sufficient erudition not only to adapt the Latin debates to his own vernacular, but even to improve upon their pedantries. In general, however, his treatment of the material is such as to give it a wider and more popular appeal. The narrative, picturesque, and allegorical elements are emphasized; the contestants are visualized as persons; and the interest is in a measure transferred to the human aspect of their acts and words.²

¹ Cf. also the following reference:

Comme en Sapience lirez:
Par via tout mal vient, etc.

² The first speech of Water is introduced by a narrative describing Water's gentle manner of speech. The language of the argument is more glowing and picturesque. "You are common and unregarded," says Wine, "mais moi on me baise et accolé. I live with *amoreus et chantants gallants*; quand s'en vont, il leur fault lanternes. You make men pale; I cause them to flush *comme rose qui boutonne*."

This enriching and nationalizing of the theme is characteristic of the vernacular versions of Latin debates. The extraordinary vividness and power of the best known English version of the Debate of the Body and the Soul is the result of a similar infusion of the local and concrete into the *Visio Philiberti*. What the English poem loses in sonorousness and liturgical quality it more than makes up by its poignant reality. The suggestion for such a treatment in the case of the French *Débat* had undoubtedly come from the Latin, but the vivifying touch of the vernacular was necessary to carry the process further and truly popularize the theme. The wide circulation of the poem in cheap prints in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and its survival in various derivative forms in France to the present day show how well the author of this adaptation had done his work.

One further step in the history of the debate in France remained to be taken. The subject, familiar in semi-literary versions, like the *Débat*, was yet to become completely the possession of the people as a folk *chanson*. Mr. V. Smith notes the occurrence in France, side by side with more artificial dialogues learned by the people directly from the printed sheets of the *colporteur*,¹ of simple tradi-

¹ Such a version has been recorded from oral tradition in the neighborhood of Metz. See *Chants populaires recueillis dans le pays messin*, par Théodore Puymaigre, Paris, 1865, p. 191 (LXIII). This piece is reported to have been frequently sung at Maizeroy and elsewhere, also to have been circulated in broadside form. Fleury, *Littérature orale de la Basse-Normandie* (1883), p. 230, notes that the same version is popular in Normandy. The poem is written in a ten-line stanza *ababccdeed*; in substance it resembles the *Débat* more closely than any other version, and Puymaigre is right, I think, in believing it to be a derivative of that piece. He gives a number of parallels, to which the following may be added:

tional versions of the debate. He gives some pretty stanzas from Vorey,¹ which shall be quoted here.

En me promenant tout le long d'un ruisseau,
J'entendis le Vin et l'Eau qui se disaient contraire.

Le Vin dit a la Rivière; " Mais que tu est mauvaise!
Toute personne qui boit de toi est bien mal à son aise."

Voici l'Eau qui lui répond d'une douce manière:
" Moi qui nourris la truite pour la grossir ensuite
Et tous les petits poissons qui viennent à ma suite."

Voici le Vin qui répond d'une grosse manière:
" Moi fais chanter les hommes quant ils sont à table
Et les fais vivre en riant dans leur petit ménage."

Voici l'Eau qui lui répond d'une grosse manière:
" Moi l'on fait la lessive pour blanchir la chemise,
L'on me dresse des moulins pour faire la farine."

Voici le Vin qui lui répond d'une grosse manière:
" Et moi l'on renferme dans un tonneau de chêne;
Lors qu'on a besoin de moi l'on me perce à l'oreille."

Voici l'Eau qui lui répond d'une douce manière:
" Moi sers au saint baptême, toi n'es pas de même:
J' admets les enfants du monde au saint nom de l'église."

Helas! que tu es folle! (Metz version; the stanza goes on to describe the senseless meanderings of water)

Tu cours partout com une folle. (Débat)

There are, however, the usual resemblances to other versions. Thus the description of the destructive effects of floods, which appears in the Metz version as in the Italian poems, the *Denudata Veritate*, etc., has no parallel in the *Débat*. It is noteworthy that in this poem, as in the folk versions generally and the Italian pieces, Water has the last word.

The opening stanzas of another *colporteur chanson*, given by Smith, are quite different from the above; yet they also suggest derivation from the *Débat*. Note especially the following:

S'il manquait mon arrosée
Que deviendrais-tu avec ton bois tordu.

¹ V. Smith, *Un Débat Chanté, Romania*, vi (1877), p. 596.

Anything more widely different in spirit from the Wine and Water poems hitherto discussed can hardly be imagined. And yet every argument here advanced by Wine or Water is to be found in almost identical form in the fourteenth-century *Débat*,—a fact which is not noted in Smith's article or elsewhere. Even the formula “l'eau répond d'une douce manière” is represented in the literary dispute by several lines describing Water's suave and urbane manner or reply.¹ The parallels are too striking to be accidental. We are led, therefore, to suppose that the literary version found its way down through the medium of the *colporteur* to the simplest stratum of society and was transformed by the alchemy of the folk into this charming song. The lyric can hardly be thought the source of the literary debate, since, as we have seen, the latter is manifestly derived from the older Latin *conflictus*. The alternative,—that the folk-song, in some form, is the source even of Latin poems—seems to me from the nature of the material highly improbable. Bacchanalian literature is an original product not of the village green but of the tavern. We have already noted, moreover, the close dependence of the Latin pieces on other Goliardic verse.

In connection with the French debates I may mention a modern Basque song, published with a French translation by Francisque Michel.² The poem consists of twelve ten-line stanazs, the last verse in each being repeated as a

¹ The passage in the *Débat* also suggests the “grosse manière” of Wine; Water, says the poet,

Ne fut pas si estourdie
En parole ne se hardie
Comme le Vin qui la tensa,
Tout bas de parle s'avansa.

² *Le Pays Basque*, p. 355.

refrain. Though the piece follows no one of the extant poems exactly, it is referable in a general way to the French tradition represented in the *Débat*, and its derivatives. The absence of narrative setting, the simplification of the arguments, and the final silencing of Wine, ally the song with the popular as opposed to the literary treatments of the theme. It is not a true folk-lyric, however, but belongs rather to the class of the semi-popular version from Metz.

III. SPANISH

The literary debate of Wine and Water found its way early into Spanish literature. It appears in a thirteenth-century Castilian poem,¹ probably of Provençal origin, in which the debate proper is curiously combined with an amatory dialogue in the style of the *pastourelle*. Originally the two parts of the "romance" must have existed as separate poems. In combining them the copyist or translator appears to have telescoped the two similar introductions.² As it stands the narrative runs as follows:

¹ The text has been frequently printed owing to its interest as one of the few examples of Spanish literature earlier than the fourteenth century. See Morel-Fatio in *Romania*, xvi, pp. 364 ff.; Monaci, *Testi basso-latini e volgari della Spagna*, Roma, 1891; Egidio Gorra, *Lingua e lettatura spagnuole delle origini*, Milano, 1898; G. Petraglione, *Studi di Filologia Romanza*, viii, p. 494. Cf. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología*, p. xxviii.

² This is the theory of Petraglione, who prints the two parts separately, taking lines 11-36 from the "Razon d'Amor" and making them, together with the conclusion of the love poem as printed by Morel-Fatio, the introduction of the debate. Note that the garden opening is found in one other example of the Wine and Water debate. (Below, p. 344.) The episode of the dove may be regarded as simply a fanciful variation of the conventional narrative explanation of how the drinks are mixed.

The poet, taking an April walk in an olive orchard, sees in the branches of one of the trees a vase full of clear cool wine. It was placed there, we are told, by the lady of the garden for her lover, and whoever drinks of it shall never fall sick. Coming nearer, the poet discovers another vase, full of cold water. He is about to drink, but desists for fear of enchantment. So much apparently constituted the opening of the original debate. It is sufficiently characteristic. At this point the poet lies down by a lovely fountain not previously mentioned, sees a beautiful woman, his own beloved, coming through the orchard, and holds conversation with her. We hear no more of the vases until the close of the love poem, when the author reverts to them. As he is about to sleep, a white dove flies toward the fountain, but, seeing him there, turns and enters the vase of water instead. As the bird flies out again in fright, the water is upset into the wine. In this astonishing manner the author makes his transition to the dispute between the two drinks.

There is little to distinguish the course of the argument which follows, from that of the debates which we have been considering. The tone of the dispute is colloquial; the contestants indulge in personalities and epithets much in the manner of the "flyting." The precious pair are visualized with a good deal of humor. The following passage may be quoted:

Ell agua iaze muerta rridiendo
De lo qu'el vino esta diciendo.
Don vino, si vos de Dios salut,
Que vos me fagades agora una vertud:
Fartad bien un villano,
No lo prenda ninguno de la mano,
Et si, antes d'una passada, no cayere en el lodo,
Dios sodes de tod en todo;
E si esto fayedes,

Otorgo que vencuda m'avedes.
 En una blanca paret
 .V. kandelas ponet,
 E si el beudo non dixiere que son .c.,
 De quanto digo de todo miento.

The suggestion of a judicial test in these lines is a very early instance of the adoption of legal language in the vernacular debate.

In substance the poem is most nearly parallel to the *Denudata Veritate*, some passages being practically paraphrases of the Latin.¹ Specific resemblances between the Spanish and the other Latin and French versions of the dispute are in comparison trifling. Yet they are sufficiently numerous to make it seem unlikely that the author of this poem or its original was influenced by the *Denudata* alone.² The widely known *Dialogus* may have furnished a few hints in this case as it appears to have done in others where the *Denudata* tradition is in the main adhered to. The problem of relations becomes increasingly complicated and baffling as we examine more versions of the debate.

A second version of the debate of Wine and Water in

¹ For example, the following:

Yo fago al ciego vejer
 Y al coxo correr
 Y al mudo faublar
 Y al infermo organar.

See above, p. 325. Cf. also the following parallels: La mesa sin mi nada non val; Mensa pro (var. per) te non ornatur; E sueles tanto andar con polvo mesclada Fasta qu'en lodo eres tornada"; see above, p. 331.

² The baptism and sacrament motives, neither of which appears in the *Denudata*, are common to the Spanish poem, the *Dialogus*, and the French *Débat*. Peculiar also to these three is Wine's boast that it is shut up in casks as a precious thing. These features recur, as we shall see, in other vernacular versions.

Spanish is reprinted by Wright from an eighteenth-century broadside.¹ The dispute occurs, this time, before Don Quixote de la Mancha! Wine enters complaint that it is being forced into unnatural union with Water, and continues to praise itself, at length, in the usual terms. Water replies with great garrulity, not merely exalting its own usefulness but stating reasons why the mixing of the two is desirable. The countries in which wine is drunk unmixed, England, Germany, and Sweden, are full of heresy, while in Spain, where wine is drunk with water, heresy has no foothold. The judge, after due consultation with "el discreto Sancho Panza," pronounces in favor of Water's suit, not necessarily in favor of water as a drink.

This debate is distinguished from the earlier Spanish version by its length and its comparative dignity of tone. The contestants rely on abundance of argument rather than on retort. There is some attempt at humor, but on the whole the piece is long-winded and dull. The use of a single plea on the part of each speaker reveals the element of legal parody.

In detail this debate contains more new matter than either the earlier Spanish version or the French *Débat*. The argument is enlivened with local allusions and with proverbs. Notwithstanding these modifications, however, there is still enough of the stock material to ally the piece unquestionably with the tradition which we have been following, particularly with that branch represented by

¹ *Nuevo y curioso Romance, en que se refiere el pleyto y publico desafio que tuvo el Agua con el Vino, para saber qual de los era de mayor utilidad y provecho.* Latin Poems, pp. 306 ff. Morel-Fatio says that the style of the poem indicates that it could not have been written earlier than the eighteenth century.

the *Denudata* and the *Débat*.¹ The resemblances are so indefinite that it is impossible to determine which of his predecessors primarily influenced the author of the *Romance*. What does seem clear, however, is the direct influence of the *Dialogus*. The change of water to wine at Cana, the drunkenness of Noah and Lot, the use of water in baptism and wine in the sacrament, all appear in the *Romance* as in the *Dialogus*. A more conclusive parallel is the passage in which Water claims honor as the first created thing, over which brooded the spirit of God.

In Spain, as in France, the dispute of Wine and Water was made the theme of a *chanson*, which has lived among the peasants until recent times.² This popular debate has not, so far as I know, been published, and I have been unable to compare it with the other versions.³

IV. ITALIAN

In Italy the debate of Wine and Water was even more popular than in France or Spain. It seems to have been a favorite with the public reciters from the fourteenth

¹ The basis of the dispute is the original question of the mixing of wine and water. There appear in the course of the argument Wine's boast that it can cure the blind and deaf, its condemnation of its rival on the ground of filth, Water's statement that the vine would never grow but for its influence—all of which motives are common in the *Denudata*, the *Débat*, and the earlier Spanish poems.

² Morel-Fatio, *op. cit.*, p. 366: "Au siècle dernier, les aveugles d'Espagne vendaient encore par les rues une romance où était narré le plaid du vin avec l'eau, et dans une de nos provinces se chante aujourd'hui une forme très populaire de ce débat."

³ A dispute between Chocolate and Wine, *Xácaro del gracioso desafío que tuvieron el chocolate y el vino*, in a *pliego suelto* of c. 1670, is noted by F. Wolf, *Studien zur Span. und Port. Nat.-Lit.*, p. 371.

century, and it was very early printed. There are three distinct Italian versions, all accessible in modern reprints. The first, which I shall designate *A*, was published in 1897 by Professor Rajna from a Milanese codex belonging to the early fifteenth century.¹ The poem itself, as Rajna suggests, is probably still older. The dialect is a hybrid Lombard; and the text in the manuscript used by Rajna is far from perfect. The introductory stanza, bespeaking the attention of the audience, betrays the minstrel origin of the piece.

The *locus* of the dispute is a garden, where, seated beneath a pine tree, the author overhears the quarrel. Water speaks first, thereby breaking all tradition in the debate. Nothing is said of the usual unholy union; though Water commands Wine to depart from beside it, and threatens to deprive its enemy of its strength. The two drinks argue in alternate speeches of one or two stanzas length. The tone is familiar, even vulgar, and both drinks indulge freely in personal abuse. At the close Wine suddenly acknowledges its own inferiority, and Water agrees

De mesgiare tego e fare la paxe.

Another trace of the original *causa bellandi*!

The next Italian version, here called *B*, is known in several Florentine prints of the sixteenth century. Professor Wiese, who gives a corrected text,² points out that

¹ *Contrasto dell' Acqua e del Vino*; Firenze, 1897, *Per nozze d'Ancona-Orvieto*. Professor Rajna reports another fifteenth-century manuscript in Seville.

² *Festschrift beim Eingang in das neue Gebäude der städtischen Oberrealschule zu Halle a.S.*, Halle, 1908, pp. 65 ff.; *Zum Streitgedichte zwischen Wein und Wasser, Zwei neue italienische Bear-*

the original dialect appears to have been Lombard rather than Tuscan. The poem, which is written in quatrains, is without narrative introduction, but a reference to "persone gentile e degne de honore" and the concluding address "alli auditori" point to minstrel origin. This debate is longer than the *A* version and rather more polite; in other respects the two are much alike, many of the motives and phrases of the one being found almost word for word in the other. Again Wine acknowledges defeat in humble terms, and the two make peace. "Would that Guelph and Ghibelline might do the same!" is the heartfelt comment of the author.

The third Italian version, *C*, extant in two Florentine prints, the earlier dated 1500, has also been edited by Professor Wiese.¹ Like the others, it was evidently designed for public recitation. The reader is deluded by the opening narrative—"There once was a king, magnanimous and potent, who had a realm, and a city, and a lady fair"—into the expectation of something different; but within four stanzas the *giullare* has led us gently into the beaten highway of the old debate. At the table of this king there was a golden vessel of precious wine and another of water. As the monarch was about to lift the former to his lips it began suddenly to glorify itself, thus provoking the jealousy of its rival. The dispute proceeds in alternate octaves until Wine succumbs. The singer invokes the blessing of God on all his hearers.

It is clear, even from the brief sketches which I have given, that the three Italian pieces stand in a measure by

beitungen: II., Incomincia la nobilissima Historia della disputacione del Vino et dell' Acqua, Cosa bellissima da ridere composta nuovamente.

¹ *Loc. cit., I., El Contrasto dell'Acqua et del Vino.*

themselves. The victory of Water rather than Wine¹ and the absence of the usual ground of the dispute, separate them from the main stream of the tradition. On the other hand, the arguments are almost without exception those with which we are familiar. Examined in detail, the substance of the Italian poems is more closely parallel to the French *Débat* than to any other extant version.² But there are a few echoes³ of the *Denudata* and perhaps of the *Dialogus* which are not to be found in the *Débat*. We are forced to the conclusion, therefore, that the Italian branch of the tradition, like the Spanish, either results from a combination of influences or goes back to a lost version of the dispute, from which the *Débat* itself was probably derived. The latter hypothesis seems to me more reasonable, although the direct influence of other versions may have been felt as well.

As to the relation of the Italian poems among themselves, *A* stands in particularly close relation with *B*,⁴

¹ Cf., however, the *Desputoison*, above p. 331, and the later Spanish version, above p. 342.

² See the parallels given in footnotes by Wiese. A close examination of these passages will show that in most cases where the same motive appears in several versions the phraseology is most nearly that of the *Débat*, while several of the motives appear only in one or more of the Italian poems and the *Débat*. See, especially, stanzas 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 21, 27, 32, 33, in the *B* version; 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 22, in *C*; and vv. 34, 40-43, 54-55, 64-65, 79, 82, in *A*.

³ Cf. *C*, stanza 11, with the parallel from *Denudata* given by Wiese; see also *C*, stanza 15 (cf. *A*, vv. 88-93), and 11 (an almost certain reminiscence of the *Dialogus*).

⁴ The resemblances are matters of detail rather than of general plan. Cf. the following passages:

“Te toria la forza e lo vigore.” *B*

“Eyo t’o tote la forza e l’ vigore. *A*

“Gia sai tu che da bevere non sei sana.” *B*

“Za sa’ tu ben che da beve non e sana.” *A*

For similar parallels see Wiese’s notes, esp. *B*, stanzas 7, 21, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, etc.

while *C* has a few specific points of resemblance with the other two.¹ *B* might possibly be the direct source of *A*, but this is unlikely, since *A*, appearing in a manuscript over a century older than the earliest print of *B*, is presumably the earlier version. *A* certainly could not have been the source of *B*, since the latter contains many features of the French *Débat* from which *A* departs. It seems highly probable that more than one Italian treatment of the Wine and Water material has disappeared.

What is of greater literary interest, however, than the exact relation of these poems, is the fact that the traditional material was lastingly popular in Italy, as a part of the repertoire of the public entertainers. The debate type in general was a favorite with these minstrels, lending itself easily to dramatic recitation.² The narrative introduction and conclusion, which are usually though not always present, show that the pieces were intended for recitation by a single individual, impersonating in turn the two contestants. By an easy transition, however, they might be converted into actual dialogue, with an increasing emphasis on action. The debate is rightly recognized as one of the factors in the development of the modern drama.³ In thus using the contest of Wine and Water for public recitation, the Italians undoubtedly had predecessors in the Latin minstrels of the Goliardic fraternity. For, while

¹ Stanzas 7 (cf. *B* 29), 10, 15 (cf. *A*, vv. 88-93), 7 (cf. *A*, vv. 75-6 and *B* stanza 29).

² See D'Ancona, *Origini del teatro Italiano*, Turino, 1891, I, pp. 547 ff.; J. L. Klein, *Geschichte des Italienischen Dramas*, Vol. I. (*Ges. des Dram.*, IV.), pp. 230 ff.

³ On the relation between debate and drama see in addition to Klein and D'Ancona, Hauréau, *Notices et Extraits*, VI, p. 32; Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature*, I, pp. 232 ff.

the *Dialogus* seems rather like a literary performance designed for the reader, the *Denudata* has the tone and the hall marks of the *joculator*. Note, for example, the closing stanza :

Ego præsens disputator,
Hujus cantus terminator,
Omni dieo populo; etc.

Precisely this difference between the two poems may account for the preponderating influence of the latter on the Wine and Water poems in the various vernaculars.

The French and Spanish poems in their present form are evidently reading pieces, but the dispute of Wine and Water must have been publicly recited in France and Spain as it was in Italy. Such universal recitation of the debate will serve partly to explain the persistent echoing in the extant poems of motives from many different versions. It will also explain its transmission to the people and re-creation as a *chanson*.

V. GERMAN

In Germany oral tradition plays by far the largest part in the history of the debate between Wine and Water. As early as the sixteenth century semi-popular versions of the dispute appear in *fliegende Blätter*, and within the last century *Volkslieder*, apparently deriving from these earlier forms, have been recorded from many different sections of the country. Of purely literary versions, on the other hand, I can point to but one, a curious mythological *Umbildung* of the theme, composed by that most

prolific writer of debates, Hans Sachs, in the year 1536.¹

The poet, who has accompanied the imperial army to Italy, is walking alone by the sea at Genoa, when he comes upon a kind of arbor. Within sits Bacchus, stark naked, crowned with grapes. As the god is drinking, the poet beholds Neptune come to shore in a shell, approach the "reben-heuslein" quickly, and deluge it with water from his mouth. Bacchus gives a cry of rage. Jupiter comes sailing down on an eagle to see what the trouble is; and the god of wine begins his complaint. Neptune, he says, is doing his best to drive him from the earth. He gets in with him everywhere and steals his strength. The sea god replies that Bacchus denies him due honor. God created water in the beginning as one of the four elements; Bacchus retorts that wine too was created early, for Noah drank it; Bacchus himself planted it in Greece. Christ changed his sacred blood to wine. Water is dirty, "stinkend und trüb wie ein misthüll," wine pure as a gem. As the dispute proceeds, many motives are echoed with which we are familiar: the quick self-purification of water; its utility in driving mills, carrying ships, and nourishing fish; the need which the vine itself has for its ministrations, etc., etc. Bacchus reproaches its rival with being the home of

Unzifer und schedlich würm
Gifftige thier mancherley fürm
Als schlängent, frösch und cocodrilln.

Water sinks many a good ship. Wine gives richness to life's feast; it makes the lively brain, the glowing cheek, and the merry heart. Water answers that wine is rather

¹ Works, edited by A. von Keller, iv, pp. 247 ff.: *Ein Kampff-gesprech zwischen wasser und wein.*

the source of crimes and follies, witness the stories of Noah, Lot, Alexander, Herod, etc. Bacchus declares that such histories are to be attributed not to wine but to excess, which Paul forbade. Water's destructiveness is proved by the great flood and by the drowning of Pharaoh's host. Jupiter, after duly considering this welter of argument, pagan, Christian, and Hebraic, decides that both wine and water have their uses, but that wine shall remain unmixed.

Aside from the characteristic mythological elaboration and a slight aroma of the quaint personality of Hans Sachs, there is little of originality in this debate. Like the Italian poems it has more in common with the French *Débat* than with any other one extant poem;¹ but the references to Pharaoh, Noah, and Lot, together with several other details, suggest the influence also of the *Dialogus*.

The dispute was evidently much at home on German soil, from which, perhaps, it originally sprung. Even before the Nürnberg *Meistersänger* elaborated the material, it was being circulated in more popular form in broadsides, and the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries saw the publication of several closely related versions.²

Three of these may claim our attention for a moment.

¹ Cf. especially the following lines:

Nimbt mir mein krafft und edlen geschmachn.
Car ma puissance s'ameindrit.
Bin eynes der vier element.
Je suis l'ung des quatre elemens.
Ich mach schön röszlet das antlitz.
Rougist comme rose qui boutonne.

² See Otto Böckel, *Deutsche Volkslieder aus Oberhessen*, pp. xv and 108, for references; also Birlinger-Creelius, *Des Knaben Wunderhorn*, II, pp. 429 ff. The earliest prints date from the early years of the sixteenth century. See *Wunderhorn*, loc. cit.

They are reprinted in Arnim and Brentano's *Wunderhorn*¹ from *fliegende Blätter* of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. All have certain features in common which mark them as belonging to a single type. In each, the arguments of the more literary versions are simplified and shortened. The disputants speak in alternate stanzas, beginning with set formulas. The narrative element has entirely disappeared. In substance, the three have a general resemblance throughout, and occasional passages are practically identical.² The kinship of the group with the literary debates is sufficiently remote. Still, there are not wanting echoes which we may recognize as coming from the more elaborate forms of the dispute. Thus a faint trace of the old mixing motive appears in the lines:

Kein will das ander leiden,
Wöllen sich beide scheiden.³

And in Wine's complaint:

Wasser, ich hab dein Schand!
In dem Keller und auf dem Land,
Du thust mir, Wasser, so bang;
Du willt dich zu mir mengen,
Thust mir nur schwächen und schänden.
(From the Nürnberg version, printed before 1529.)

The idea contained in the following stanza from the third

¹ Berlin, 1857, part iv, pp. 179 ff.

² See below, pp. 354, 355 and notes.

³ The same motive recurs in most of the traditional versions. See, for example, that printed by Sztachovics, p. 140 (below, p. 356, n. 1):

Der Wein kanns Wasser nicht leiden,
and at the close

Der Wein musz Wasser wol leiden.

version, printed at Augsburg about 1657,¹ may be paralleled in the *Dialogus*, the French *Débat*, and elsewhere:

Der Wein der sprach: man pflegt mein basz,
Man faszt mich in ein starkes Fasz;
Man lässt dich täglich rinnen,
Dein ist gar viel zu finden.²

Water's various utilities—cleansing, driving mills, breeding fish, and nourishing the vine itself,—and the use of water and wine in the sacrament and baptism, are motives common to the literary versions and to one or more of the German debates. There can be little doubt, I think, that these pieces derive from some form of the literary debate.

The transformation which the old material has undergone is all in the direction of adapting the dispute to the popular ear and to song; yet two, at least, of these German poems³ are not popular in the same sense as the French *chanson* quoted above or the modern German songs of which I shall speak in a moment. They appear to have belonged rather to the wandering entertainer, the professional or semi-professional *Bänkelsänger*, than to the folk, in which case they would correspond exactly to the three Italian debates. Like the latter, they open with the characteristic appeal to the audience:

Nun hört, ihr Herren allgemein,
Wohl von dem Wasser und dem Wein.⁴

¹The same poem, somewhat changed, is printed from a manuscript of about 1673 in the Birlinger-Crecelius edition of the *Wunderhorn*.

²Substantially the same in the Nürnberg version.

³The Nürnberg version, *Wunderhorn*, p. 179; and that printed at Basel in 1607, *Wunderhorn*, p. 183.

⁴The second piece has

Nun lost, ihr Christen allgemein,
Wohl von dem Wasser und dem Wein.

And in the conclusion we catch still more clearly the minstrel note:

Das Wasser hat den Preis allzeit,
 Wann es den grössten Nutzten geit;
 Es hat mich wahrlich nie erfreut,
 Darum lob ich den Weine:
 Kumm her, Ich lasz dich eine!

Der Wein der schmeckt mir also wohl,
 Macht mich Summer und Winter voll,
 Gefällt meiner Frauen nit wohl,
 Bringt ihr ein heimlichs Leiden,
 Doch kann ich ihn nicht meiden.¹

It is curious that the German poems agree with the Italian also in the fact that Wine finally acknowledges itself defeated. But in Germany even the earliest of these versions is simpler and more truly popular than any of the Italian pieces, having clearly been framed on the model of other popular and semi-popular debates.²

The public recitation or singing of the debate may, as

¹ Not found in the 1607 version, but cf. the close of the third (Augsburg) print.

² Cf. with the opening formulas quoted above the opening of the debate of the Body and the Soul:

Nun hoeret zu ihr Christenleut
 Wie Leib und Seel gen einander streit.

And more especially the first stanza of *Buchsbaum und Felbinger*, a derivative of the debate of Winter and Summer. (*Wunderhorn*, ed. Birlinger-Creelius, II, p. 427):

Nun wölt ir hören newe Mär
 Von Buchsbaum und vom Felbinger
 Sie zugen mitainander über Feld,
 Und kriegten mit ainander.

Der Buchsbaum sprach: "Bin ich so kün," etc.

The title of the Nürnberg print is "Ein new Lied von dem Wasser und dem Wein. In des Buchsbaum thon."

I have suggested, serve to explain its incorporation into the body of folk tradition. Learned first from *Bänkelsänger* or *giullare*, who had himself thrown it into popular form, the dispute would have passed from mouth to mouth, changing in character as it went, until the material had become thoroughly assimilated by the folk. We have good evidence that this was the case in Germany, at least. The broadside versions themselves show successive stages in the popularization of the dispute. Thus the earliest of the three prints is written entirely in a five-line stanza rhyming *aaabb*, the second partly in that measure and partly in the four-line stanza, *aabb*, the latest entirely in the simpler measure. The latest (1657) version, moreover, is much shorter than the others, 60 lines against 115 in the first and 84 in the second. In these respects it stands midway between the minstrel pieces and the oral versions of the nineteenth century. The latter mark the last step in the process of popularization. That they derive from the earlier tradition and particularly from the form represented in the Augsburg print cannot be doubted, the variations from the latter being only such as are naturally incident to oral tradition.

I quote in full as an example of these versions the debate recorded by Böckel¹ from upper Hesse:

1. Es gingen einst zu streiten
Das Wasser und der Wein,
Wer sei der beste von beiden?
Drum fingen sie an zu streiten.
2. Da sprach es der Wein: wie bin ich so fein,²

¹ *Deutsche Volkslieder*, no. 8.

² Ein jedlichs will das besser sein (Basel).
Ein jeglichs will das beste sein. (Nürnberg).

³ The same motive is used in the Winter and Summer debate, in

Man schenkt mich in die Gläser hinein,
 Man trägt mich vor Fürsten und Herren,
 Sie trinken mich alle so gern.¹

3. Da sprach es das Wasser: wie bin ich *so fein*,
 Man trägt mich in die Küche hinein,
 Man braucht mich zum Waschen und Kochen
 Man braucht mich die ganze Wochen.²

4. Da sprach es der Wein: wie bin ich *so fein*,
 Man trägt mich in die Kirche hinein,
 Man braucht mich zum Sacramente,
 Ein jeder vor seinem Ende.³

5. Da sprach es das Wasser: wie bin ich *so fein*,
 Man trägt mich in die Kirche hinein,
 Man braucht mich zum Kindeleintaufen.⁴
 Furs Geldchen lasz ich mich nicht kaufen.

6. Da sprach es der Wein: du hast Recht
 Du bist der Herr und ich bin der Knecht,
 Hättest du mich nicht beregnet.
 Hätte die Sonne mich nicht gesegnet.⁵

the debate of Buchsbaum and Felbinger, and in other similar pieces.
 Cf. Augsberg version: Der Wein sprach: Wasser, merk mich *fein*.

¹ Man geuszt mich in silber und rothes Gold,
 Und bringt mich vor grosze Herren,
 Man hat mich allzeit gerne. (Augsberg.)

² In mir badt man die Kindelein,
 Man braucht mich die ganze Wochen
 Zu backen und zu kochen. (Augsberg.)

The same in Basel version; slightly different in Nürnberg.

³ Man trägt mich in die Kirchen hinein;
 Man braucht mich zum Sacramente,
 Es braucht mich mancher vor seim Ende. (Augsberg.)

The same in Basel; does not appear in Nürnberg.

⁴ See note 5. In mir baden die Kindlein (Basel).
 Aus mir badt man die Kindlein klein. (Nürnberg.)

⁵ Der Wein sprach: ich geb dir recht,
 Du bist mein Herr und ich dein Knecht;

Once established as a popular song, the debate spread to almost every part of Germany. Versions similar to the above, but all differing more or less in detail, have been taken down during the last century from oral recitation in many dialects.¹

In connection with the German debates may be mentioned a Wine and Water poem in Rhæto-Romanic,² which is a line for line translation of the sixteenth-century (Nürnberg) print. How faithful is the rendering may be seen from the following comparison of their opening stanzas:

Wärst du mir mit kommen,
In der Sonnen wär ich verbronnen. (Augsberg).

Begehrt Alls meiner Hilfe,
Du thust selbs zu mir gilfen. (Nürnberg.)

The *Herr* and *Knecht* motive appears also in the Winter and Summer debate, in the debate of Buchsbaum and Felbinger, etc.

¹ *Wunderhorn* (ed. of 1857), II, p. 37; F. W. von Ditfurth, *Fränkische Volkslieder* (1855), II, p. 268 (No. 352; very similar to the preceding); Sztachovics, *Brautsprüche und Brautlieder auf dem Heideboden in Ungarn* (1867), p. 140 (A shorter form of *Wunderhorn*, II, p. 37); *ib.*, p. 144 (From a print of 1787. Substantially the same as the preceding); A. Birlinger, *Schwäbische Volkslieder* (1864), p. 60 (No. 33); A. Schlossar, *Deutsche Volkslieder aus Steiermark* (1881), No. 317; K. von Leoprechting, *Aus dem Lechraint* (1855), p. 265 (Very close to the preceding); A. Peter, *Volksthümliches aus Österreichisch-Schlesien* (1665), I, p. 340 (No. 173; except for slight verbal variations and the omission of one stanza, identical with the Lechraint version); B. Pogatschnigg and E. Hermann, *Deutsche Volkslieder aus Kärnten*, II, p. 573; C. Mundel (1884), p. 212; *Wunderhorn* (ed. Birlinger-Creelius), II, p. 435; L. Tobler, *Schweizerische Volkslieder* (1882), No. 72; F. W. Schuster, *Siebenbürgisch-sächsische Volkslieder* (1865), p. 425; Jeitteles, *Das deutsche Volkslied in Steiermark, Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte*, IX, p. 384; E. Meier, *Schwäbische Volkslieder* (1855), p. 263.

² Extant in two dialects; see Ulrich, *Rhætoromanische Chrestomathie*, II Theil, *Engadisch*, pp. 125 ff.; *Zeitschrift für Rom. Phil.*, VI, p. 64.

Nun hört, ihr Herren allgemein,
Wol von dem Wasser und dem
Wein,
Ein jegliches will das beste sein,
Keins will das ander leiden,
Wöllen sich beide scheiden.

Brigada qui tadlad sü bain,
Da l'agua éd dawart ilg uyn,
Ilg mélicher esser uoul schkudün
Nè s'uoellgen cumpartare,
Lün drett a l'auter daare.

This is the single instance, so far as I know, in which one Wine and Water debate has been literally translated from another. It was much easier to construct an "original" poem out of the old material.

VI. HEBREW

The opportunity afforded by the debate of Wine and Water for scriptural and ritualistic reference, made the subject appeal strongly to the mediæval Hebrew writers, whose fondness for the debate type in general is abundantly proved by Professor Moriz Steinschneider's recent bibliography.¹ Not less than six Hebrew versions in rhyme and meter of our dispute are listed by Steinschneider. The dates and nationalities are in most cases indeterminable. So far as I have been able to obtain access to these pieces and to read them in translation, the thorough assimilation of the material to Jewish modes of thought and expression has left them little resemblance to any of the European versions. In three of the Hebrew poems, however, (Steinschneider, 124, 127, and 128) the drowning of Pharaoh's host is mentioned as an honor to water. In the poem signed in acrostic Jehuda ben Elia (Steinschneider, 124) Water draws an argument for its superiority from the fact that it was created first. The

¹ *Rangstreit-Literatur, Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad., Phil.-Hist.-Kl.*, 155 (4), (1907-8).

motive "water is not sold for a price," which appears in the same poem, has its parallel in the German folk-song:

Fürs Geldchen lasz ich mich nicht kaufen.

The judgment in this piece, that water should be mixed with wine, since neither is good alone,¹ seems like an echo of the western versions, though it appears in just this form only in one of the Spanish poems. The disgrace of Lot and Noah through wine, which I have noted as a frequently recurrent argument, appears in the Hebrew debate signed with the acrostic of Zalman Sofer (scribe), (Steinschneider, 128). In a third (incomplete) poem (Steinschneider, 127) water employs another familiar argument: "What will Wine do when the burning heat comes? And if no rain falls a vine is all dried up."²

These motives may, of course, have suggested themselves independently to the Jewish authors. It is more likely that they are reminiscences of the European versions. In one form or another this debate existed everywhere. The Rabbis were fond of the debate type, which they knew from Arab as well from European literature, and it is natural that they should have borrowed this material, as they borrowed so much else, from their Christian neighbors.

As an illustration of the manner in which the Hebrews appropriated the old material I append a literal translation of Zalman Sofer's poem,³ which Professor George

¹ The mixing of wine and water was a Hebrew-Yiddish custom. See Steinschneider, p. 71, note 2.

² Cf. also Zalman Sofer's poem, below, p. 359, stanza 4.

³ Published by M. Steinschneider, in N. Brüll, *Jahrbücher für Jüdische Geschichte und Litteratur*, ix (1889), pp. 2 f. A Yiddish version with the same acrostic accompanies the Hebrew. The two amount practically to different poems. The rhyme scheme in the

F. Moore of Harvard kindly furnished me, together with the very necessary explanations in the notes:

CONTENDINGS¹ OF WINE AND WATER

Offspring of the vine am I called—

 Thus spake Wine—

To him who drinks I am as a precious stone,

And to my foes, weapons of war.

From me man has deep sleep.

My glance is red.

‘Wine rejoices the heart of man.’

2. To the king I make answer,
Cries Water, in praise of itself,
Remember Noah in the ark,
And how he lay naked in the tent.

I make the herbage spring up,
By the early and the latter rain,

I am equal² to the Prophets and the Scriptures.³

3. I am eulogized in songs,
Cried Wine, at dances,
At circumcisions, too,
And joyous weddings;
I am a luxury to travellers
And to weary laborers.
With me he who says grace begins.⁴

4. Ensnared,⁵ libation wine! ⁶

Hebrew is *ababccc* for the seven line, and *ababcc* for the six line stanzas. What with acrostic, meter, and rhyme, says Professor Moore, the versifier has had a hard time, and what he meant to say is in some places somewhat less than transparent.

¹ Lit. wars.

² *I. e.*, equal in value.

³ The whole Hebrew bible except the Law!

⁴ When several blessings are said at table.

⁵ The line is obscure. The author needed an “n” for his acrostic, possibly he was thinking of Hosea, 4, 11, though the verb there is not the same.

⁶ *I. e.*, wine of idolatrous libations.

Cried Water, with bitterness,
 ' Honor thy father! '
 Thou dost owe thy being to rain,
 And thou art my son, honor me,
 In the presence of the elders of the city.

5. At that Wine shouted,
 I am better than thou,
 Thine adornment is hid away.¹
 Because of the waters of Meribah
 The faithful shepherd² was removed,
 For whose sake manna streamed
 For an unwidowed people.³

6. Then Water was incensed
 Because Wine contradicted her.
 Before the army of Heaven.⁴
 My waters were driven aside, Yea men and women
 Passed through me on dry ground.

7. Out burst bepraised Wine,
 Answered Water briefly.
 I am a libation on the altar
 Twice every day.
 Precious treasure I demand
 In money.⁵ Enough for thee! Say no more!

8. Wine was dancing and acting the lord.
 O Wine, let us not exult!
 Remember Lot's evil chance!
 He uncovered the nakedness of his daughters,
 He drank wine at their hands,
 And ravished them both, and both conceived.

¹ Possibly he means that the honor of water is withdrawn because of the incident alluded to in the next lines.

² *I. e.*, Moses, on account of his sin at the waters of Meribah.

³ *I. e.*, not yet deprived of Moses. The exigencies of the rhyme are responsible for the expression.

⁴ The Israelites at the Red Sea.

⁵ Cf. Nürnberg version, *Wunderhorn*, p. 181; "Man . . . zahlet mich mit reichem Gold"; Basel version, *Wunderhorn*, p. 184, "Gar theur laszt man dich (*l. mich*) kaufen," and *ib.*, p. 185, "Ich bin auch basz dann du bezahlt."

VII. ENGLISH

Considering the popularity of the debate of Water and Wine through continental Europe, we should be surprised if it had not found its way in some form to England. The *Dialogus* we know to have been circulated in English manuscripts, and ascribed to Walter Map. Other debates, the Body and Soul, Winter and Summer, the Heart and the Eye, Phillis and Flora, were adapted from Latin and French to English; and it is hardly probable that the street ballad-makers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries should have failed to appropriate so well-tried a subject as the dispute of Wine and Water. As a matter of fact, no such version is known to me. There is, however, a curious embodiment of the old material in a seventeenth-century drama, the title of which in the first edition (London, 1629) is as follows: *Wine, Beere, and Ale, together by the eares, a dialogue written first in Dutch by Gallo-belgicus, and faithfully translated out of the originall copie by Mercurius Brittanicus for the benefite of his nation.*¹

The *dramatis personæ* are as follows: Wine, a gentleman; Sugar, his page; Beere, a citizen; Nutmeg, his prentice; Ale, a countrey-man; Tost, one of his rural servants; Water, a parson. The play opens with a punning dialogue between Sugar, Nutmeg, and (later) Toast, who comes in drunk. The debate begins when Wine and Sugar are met by Beer, who quarrels with them for the wall.

The stock arguments appear on both sides. Beer says,

¹This first edition has not been reprinted. I have before me a photograph of the British Museum copy.

for example: "Why! Wine, art thou not kept under lock and key, . . . where Beer goes abroad and rendevois in every place?" Much of the dialogue is mere squabbling. Soon Ale enters and is drawn into the dispute by the mischievous Sugar. Wine challenges Beer to a duel and throws down his glove. Ale attempts to prove his superiority and rightful lordship, first on the score of antiquity, according to the saying: "Old Ale of England"—(Beer replies proverbially that "Joan's ale is new"); second because he has many houses; etc. Wine enters upon a familiar panegyric of himself: "I repaire the debilities of age, and revive the refrigerated spirits." The argument at length becomes so heated that the contestants draw their swords. At this point, Water comes running up to pacify "his kinsmen." They refer the dispute to him, and he settles matters amicably by "allowing each his singularity." Wine is for aristocrats; Beer, for citizens; and Ale for the country. At this decision they all become sworn brothers and sing a catch,¹ concluding with a dance "wherein the severall natures of them all is figured and represented." In a second edition, published in 1630,² the controversy is complicated by Tobacco, who enters after the others have made peace and boasts that he is the prince of them all, a heavenly quintessence, a divine herb. Ale attempts to ridicule him by giving a list of Tobacco's "military postures," as "take your seal," "draw your box," "uncase your pipe," "give fire," etc., but the

¹ This song seems to have gained some independent currency. It is printed by William Sandys, *Festive Songs principally of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Percy Soc., 23, XLIII (p. 59).

² *Wine, Beere, Ale, and Tobacco, contending for superiority*, ed. J. O. Halliwell, *The Literature of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, London, 1881.

heavenly quintessence is unabashed, and the drinks are obliged to recognize the swaggering upstart's popularity ("even the ladies begin to affect him") and to admit him of their fellowship.

This curious dramatic dialogue, though for the most part fantastically original, seems nevertheless to belong in a general way to the tradition which we are considering. The complication of the dispute by the introduction of other drinks suggests the *Altercatio vini et cervisiae*, the Spanish Wine and Chocolate poem, and Reinmar von Zweter's comparison of wine and milk. The late entrance of Water takes us back rather to the *Desputoison*, and the role of Tobacco, as I have elsewhere pointed out,¹ appears to have been suggested by the earlier debate comedy *Lingua or the Combat of the Tongue and the Five Senses*. The piece is most closely allied, however, in style and structure, to two Cambridge dialogues, *A Merry Dialogue between Band, Cuff, and Ruff*,¹ and *Work for Cutlers or a Merry Dialogue between Sword, Rapier, and Dagger*,² printed in 1516, and it seems to me highly probable that the three debates are of identical authorship.³ I put little faith in the alleged derivation of *Wine, Beere, and Ale* from the Dutch of "Gallobelgicus." The expression has much the air of a college joke; the substance of the dialogue, moreover, is thoroughly English.

Of the more popular form of the Wine and Water dispute we have in English one curious survival, a nursery

¹ *The Debate Element in the Elizabethan Drama*, *Kittredge Anniversary Papers*, Boston, 1913.

² Reprinted by Charles Hindley, *The Old Book Collector's Miscellany*.

³ I purpose to discuss this question in a forthcoming article.

rhyme published by Baring-Gould¹ in 1895 from the recitation of a Devonshire nurse. The poem consists of but two stanzas, as follows:

Said Wine to Water, So fine I be,
They carry me over both land and sea,
They call me both port and sherry,
I cause every heart to be merry,
I cause every heart to be merry.

Said Water to Wine, So useful I be,
No kitchen can do for a day without me.
For a week round I am toiling,
I am washing, I'm baking and boiling,
I am washing, I'm baking and boiling.

This little song is clearly of German importation, the last part of it being an almost literal translation of stanza 3 of the folk song printed on page 354 of this article.² By what means the fragment found its way from the country side of Germany into an English nursery is a matter of conjecture.

With this final echo of the debate of Wine and Water I conclude my history of that long-lived quarrel. I am aware that many points in this history are vague or conjectural, owing to the existence of considerable gaps in the evidence. But even if we had all the treatments of the subject, any attempt to construct a definite scheme of their relationships would be baffled by the nature of the material. Without belonging in the first instance to popular tradition, this material circulated throughout Europe

¹ *A Book of Nursery Songs and Rhymes*, London, 1898, pp. 32-33.
I owe this interesting reference to Professor Kittredge.

² Da sprach es das Wasser: wie bin ich so fein,
Man trägt mich in die Küche hinein,
Man braucht mich zum Waschen und Kochen,
Man braucht mich die ganze Wochen.

as freely and in as many forms as the great romantic stories, the beast epic, or the fabliaux. Each succeeding writer might draw upon his recollection of more than one predecessor, following no one of them as a model, but elaborating the theme in his own way. Hence the bewildering confusion of similarities and differences in the extant poems. Without, however, attempting to relate the different versions too exactly, we may draw some fairly certain conclusions regarding the general history of the dispute. The main features of this history may now be summarized.

The debate originated with the Latin rhythmic poets, the *Goliardi*, in the twelfth century, having been developed under the influence of the debate type in general out of motives familiar to the potatory literature of the time. It appears first in two forms, one more popular in character and apparently designed for recitation or singing, the other pedantic and smacking of religious parody. The two are probably related, but neither can be called a version of the other. The more popular is probably the earlier. In what country either of them was written cannot be determined, though one is inclined to look toward Germany; nor is it a matter of much importance, since they belong to a class of literature which is essentially non-national. From this very characteristic, such literature circulates freely through all nations and is easily taken over into the vernacular. The two Latin debates, we know, from the evidence of the manuscripts, to have been read and copied throughout Europe at least as late as the fifteenth century. Meanwhile the dispute had been adapted in French and Spanish, where it appears as early as the thirteenth century, probably through intermediaries now lost. The type of these as of practically all other vernacular versions of the debate is that of the more popular

Denudata rather than of the biblical *Dialogus*, but the latter certainly contributed some of the material which was incorporated in the later tradition.

Going back directly to the *Denudata* or to some form of the dispute much like it is a second French poem, belonging to the fourteenth or fifteenth century, which appears to have been an important influence in the later history of the dispute. Like the earlier French and Spanish pieces it is characterized by a tendency to romanticize the debate and to elaborate the narrative element.

The early sixteenth century saw the beginning of a wide distribution of the debate in France, Spain, Italy, and Germany, in the form of *fiegeende Blätter*, and similar prints are said to have been circulated by *colporteurs* in very recent times. Of these printed debates some few are of the elaborate type set by the French *Débat*; others, while belonging in a general way to the same tradition, show signs of having been adapted to the uses of popular entertainers. They are comparatively brief and simple; the narrative setting is generally absent; and the argument proceeds in alternate stanzas. Such adaptations may have been made independently by the street singers of different countries; or the material may have been passed from one group of minstrels to another.

Through these channels the dispute became familiar throughout Europe, finding its way even into such out of the way dialects as Rhæto-Romanic and Basque, and becoming very popular with the modern Hebrew and Yiddish writers. It is not surprising, therefore, that it should have been taken up into oral tradition. Popular versions have been recorded in modern times from France, Spain, England, and Germany. In the last named country, at least, the debate received a very general currency. The

oral versions there evidently go back to the form of the dispute represented in the sixteenth-century German prints.

With respect to the breadth of its distribution, the variety of its forms, and the tenacity of its hold on popular interest, this debate is surpassed by only two dialogues of its class, the debate between the Body and the Soul, and the debate between Winter and Summer.

They, like it, are the common property of Europe, and they, too, appear in both literary and popular form. In comparison with these themes the debate of Wine and Water seems barren and circumscribed. It has little more than mother wit, a touch of the ridiculous, and a certain homeliness, as concerning the things of every day, to oppose to the imaginative appeal of the great drama of the seasons, or the eternal human interest of the conflict between flesh and spirit. Yet these slighter qualities are even dearer to the popular heart, and if other subjects aroused deeper emotions, none, apparently, afforded more delight. The mere fact that this theme should have lived for centuries in many tongues is full of interest for the student of literary history.

JAMES HOLLY HANFORD.